

REMARKS

Reconsideration of all grounds of objection and rejection are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-24 and 27-30 are now pending herein. Claims 25 and 26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 27-30 depend from one of claims 9 or 22, and find support in the specification at least at page 6, lines 18-27, and is shown in FIG. 2. Claims 1, 9, 14 and 22 are independent claims.

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the indication in the Office Action that claims 9 and 22 recite allowable subject matter. These claims have been rewritten in an independent format including all the recitations of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Applicant has addressed each and every claim objection listed in the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of objection are respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14 to overcome rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-7, 10-20, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Udagawa (WO02/097804, equivalent U.S. 7,113,468). Claims 8 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Udagawa and Okuda (U.S. 5,319,625). Applicant respectfully overcomes these grounds of rejection for the reasons indicated herein below.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite in part that employing the measured signal as said feedback signal having a calculated slope and offset to dynamically tune

the source of said signal; support is clearly found in the specification at least at page 6, lines 18-27. Thus, the present claimed invention advantageously employs the feedback signal for dynamically tuning the source signal feedback. The feedback signal has a calculated slope and offset value for the tuning of the source signal that provides for a more accurate output

Applicant respectfully submits none of the present claims are anticipated by Udagawa, nor does the combination of Udagawa and Okuda disclose, suggest, or in any other way render obvious the aforementioned recitation of claims 1 and 14. Udagawa, alone or in combination with Okuda, fails to disclose or render obvious claims 1 and 14 for at least this reason.

Accordingly, none of the present claims are anticipated by or obvious over the references. Udagawa fails to disclose all the elements recited in claims 1 and 14.

In addition, Udagawa alone or combined with Okuda, are completely silent regarding the aforementioned recitation in claims 1 and 14. Nor would the combination of elements, as recited in claims 1 and 14, have been obvious as being within the ordinary level of skill in the art (*KSR International v. Teleflex*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

A fee for one additional independent claim and two additional dependent claims is submitted herein via electronic payment process.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Waxler
Registration No. 48,027


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: May 28, 2008

Mail all correspondence to:
Aaron Waxler, Registration No. 48,027
NXP, B.V.
NXP Intellectual Property Department
M/S41-SJ
1109 McKay Drive
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 434-3000
Fax: (408) 474-9081